



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*Studies in Semitic Grammar.**—By FRANK R. BLAKE, Ph.D.,
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

I. Apparent Interchange between **ה** and **ח** in Semitic.

There are quite a number of cases in the Semitic languages where we find cognate words or forms appearing now with **ה** and now with **ח**. Sometimes both forms occur in the same language, sometimes **ה** appears in one and **ח** in another. For example, we have in Hebrew both **הָאֵת** and **חִזְבָּן** ‘how’; in Biblical Aramaic **חַדָּשׁ**, in Arabic **أَنْ** ‘if’; in Hebrew and Biblical Aramaic, a causative with preformative **ה**; in Arabic, Ethiopic, and Syriac, one with preformative **ח**.

Some of these changes are undoubtedly phonetic, i. e., due to the operation of some law of simple sound change, as, e. g., is the Cockney interchange between *h* and the glottal catch; or resulting from the combination of sounds that the word presents.

The most important cases of phonetic interchange of *h* and **ח** are the following:¹

- a) In Assyrian an original Semitic *h* regularly becomes **ח**, e. g., Heb. **חָלַק**, Ass. *alâku* ‘go’.
- b) An initial **ח** seems to have become *h* in some Old Arabic dialects, e. g., *hin*, *hijâka*, *hamâ* for **חָמָא**, **חָיָאָנָكְ**.
- c) In some Aramaic dialects and in modern Syrian Arabic an **ח** is dissimilated to *h* on account of the presence of another **ח** in the word, e. g., Syr. Ar. *ha'râb* < *'a'râb* < **חָרָב** ‘bring near’, Syriac **لְתַּחֲרֵב** < *lət̪ħâ'bâ* (*t* = *t'*) ‘sin’, Mandaic *hattiqâ* < *'attiqâ* (*q* = *k*) ‘old’.

* This article was first put in type by the printers of this Journal in the summer of 1915. See the Note on page 319.

¹ Cf. Delitzsch, *Assyrische Gram.*² § 52, and Brockelmann, *Grundriss d. vergl. Gram. d. semitischen Sprachen*, vol. i, pp. 45, 240, 242f.

Many of the cases of interchange between *h* and ', however, are apparently not phonetic, but result from special causes in each case, among which analogy plays a very important part.

The chief cases of this apparent interchange are the following, viz.:—

- a) Heb. **הַנִּזְעָן**, 'how': here **נ** is the original consonant, **ה** of **הַ** being due to analogy of the interrogative particle **ה**. Similarly the Targumic interrogatives **הַיְדֵין**, **הַיְדֵין** 'which' for **אַיְדָא אַיְדָא** which also occur, are probably the result of the same analogy.
- b) Syr. **هُنَّ**, **هُنَّ** and **إِنْ**, **إِنْ** 'they': the difference in initials may be due to confusion between personal pronouns with **ه** initial and a series of accusative forms consisting of the particle **اِن** + suffix, such as occurs in Talmudic **אַיְדָה**, **אַיְדָה** 'them';¹ or, inasmuch as the forms with **ن** are employed as verbal object, the **ه** may have become **ن** or been lost completely after an immediately preceding verb, as, e. g., in English, 'I saw 'im (him)'.
- c) Arab. **ف**, Heb. and Bib. Aram. **ה**, interrogative particles: two different particles,² perhaps ultimately identical in primitive Semitic.
- d) Hebr. **מִנ**, Syr. **ل**, Arab. **إِنْ**, Eth. **እመ**, *emma*, Bib. Aram. **הַז** 'if': the **ה** of Bib. Aram. is due to the influence of the interrogative particle **ה** or perhaps is a combination of this particle and **אַנ** (cf. Hebr. **מְאַת**), the change originating in the case of 'in 'whether' in the indirect question.
- e) Arab. **إِنْ**, Heb. **הַנִּזְהָר**, 'behold'; **ن** is original, **ה** is due to the influence of demonstrative particle *hâ*.³
- f) Hebr. **מִנ**, Bib. Aram. **אֲדֹין**, Syr. **عَنْ**, **عَنْ** 'then': **ن** is original, the **ה** of the Syriac forms is probably due to

¹ Cf. Barth, *Pronominalbildung*, Leipzig, 1913, p. 19.

² **ن** as interrogative particle seems to occur in **حَلَّن** 'verily' = **حَلَّه**, and perhaps in some other particles, cf. my paper *The Interrogative Particle נ in Hebrew*, *AJSL*, vol. xxxiii, No. 2, Jan. 1917, pp. 146-148.

³ So Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, vol. i, p. 501 a. In Hebrew the *ē* of **הַ** instead of *ā* is perhaps due to the analogy of the synonymous particle **הַנִּזְהָר**.

some analogy with the demonstrative pronouns with initial **ה**, **וְ**, **טָזֵב** ‘this’ etc. What the **י** is is not clear.¹

- g) Heb. **הַקְטִיל**, Bibl. Aram; Arab. **أَفْتَلُ**, Syr. **اعْتَلَّ**, Eth. **אַפְתָּלָה**; here we have two different causative particles.²
- h) Loan words; **h** is sometimes prefixed to borrowed words beginning with a vowel, possibly an attempt to represent initial vowel without glottal catch, e. g., Heb. **הַכָּל**, Bib. Aram. **הַכָּלָן**, Syr. **سَكَلْنَةٌ** from Ass. *êkallu* (Sum. *e-gal*) Jew. Aram. **הַפְרִיקִי** from Greek **Αφρική**.³
- i) There are a number of nouns and verbs having **h** in one language and **'** in another, e. g.,

Syriac **عَذَمَا** Arabic **إِبْلٌ** ‘herd of camels’

Hebrew **תַּפְסִיר** ‘turn’ Arabic **أَفْلَك** ‘change’

Arabic **سَهْقَ** ‘thirst’ Hebrew **שְׁאֵגָה** ‘gasp after,’ etc.

In each case one form presents the original consonant, and the other form is probably modified as the result of some special analogical influence which is often not apparent.

There is a decided tendency among Semitic grammarians towards explaining all interchange in sounds as the result of a phonetic change, ignoring wholly or in part the important role played by analogy in every living speech. That many of the interchanges herein discussed are not the result of phonetic change has, I think, been well established. It is not unlikely that a closer study of many other sporadic changes of vowels and consonants would yield similar results.

II. The Etymology of the Aramaic particle **אִתָּה**.

One of the most important of the Semitic particles is the one that appears in Hebrew as **עֲשָׂה**, in Assyrian as *išu*, in Arabic as

¹ A similar **י** is found in many demonstrative adverbs, cf. Brockelmann *Grundriss*, vol. i, § 108 *passim*.

² Cf. Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, vol. i, p. 520 G. Phenician **קְטִיל** probably represents the form **לְקָטֵן** i. e., *'iqtil* < *'aqtil*, the syllable *'i* being written with **י** somewhat as in Syriac forms like **יַדָּה** ‘hand’ (pronounced *îdâ*), cf. *op. cit.*, p. 525 top.

³ Cf. Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, p. 243, Anm.

لَيْسَ = *la-isa*, all used under certain conditions to render the verb ‘to be’. With these particles the Biblical Aramaic ’אִתָּן. Syr. **אַתְּ** are regularly identified, the š being considered š¹ (= Aram. *t*, Arab. *th*), and the *s* of Arabic **لَيْسَ** being explained as due to irregular sound change.¹ The difficulty presented by the initial consonant, which is ’ in Hebrew and Arabic, and probably also in Assyrian, but נ in Aramaic, has been consistently passed over as of no moment, as an instance of a sound change which is often found in Semitic, in spite of the fact that no such phonetic law as Aram. נ = Heb. and Arab. ’ can be shown to exist.

The particles שׁ and מִ, however, are probably not identical. The š of שׁ is not to be considered š¹ but š³, like š in לְשׂוֹן, lišánu, لِسَانٌ. The particle מִ is best identified with Hebrew תְּנִ, the *nota accusativi*, the difference in meaning being such as could easily develop in the case of particles of a pronominal character, and the only other difference between the two being in the quantity of the vowel, as Hebrew ē is a secondary development of short i. Both שׁ and תְּנִ with their related forms are apparently the result of the combination of shorter particles of a demonstrative character, originally perhaps four in number, viz., jā, 'i or 'î, t, š³, which were combined in various ways to make *notae accusativi* or quasi-verbs = "to be".²

While it is impossible of course to unwind with certainty the tangled skein of phonetic and analogical changes that the various forms of שׁ and נָנָן present, the following suggestions may help to throw some light on the matter.³

Originally the demonstrative particles *jā* and *'i* were combined with both *t* and *ś*, viz., *jā-t*, *jā-ś*, *'i-t*, *'i-ś*, all used in a general demonstrative sense.⁴ When these particles stood before pro-

¹ Cf. Professor Haupt's note on pp. 50, 51 of Müller and Kautzsch, *The Book of Proverbs* (=SBOT, 15), Leipzig, 1901; and Brockelmann, *Grundriss d. veral. Gram. d. semitischen Sprachen*, vol. i, p. 235 θ.

² In Barth, *Pronominalbildung*, Leipzig, 1913, p. 95, this explanation is given for the various accusative particles, but not for *w*.

³ For some examples of the workings of analogy in the case of pronouns, cf. my *Contributions to Comparative Philippine Grammar*, JAOS, vol. xxvii, 1906, pp. 337—396 *passim*.

⁴ In South Semitic 'i and 'iā are combined to make similar demonstrative words, viz., Arabic **لِي** (*iījā < 'i-iā*), Ethiopic **ከ****ይ** (*kīiā* from *'i-iā*).

nominal suffixes, the long vowels being in open syllables were retained; when they were used before nouns the long vowels, thus standing in closed syllables, were shortened, giving rise to the forms, *'iat, iāš, 'it, 'iš*. Finally the series of forms with initial *i*, viz., *'iāt, iāš, iat, iāš*, and the series of forms with initial *'*, viz., *'it, 'iš, 'it, 'iš*, mutually influenced one another, so that we have a third series of forms resulting from analogy, viz., *'āt, 'āš, 'at, 'āš, iāt, iāš, iit, iāš*. It is by no means necessary of course to suppose that all of these forms were actually made, but all of them are certainly possible.

The form **iāt* is found in Assyrian in the oblique forms of the personal pronouns *iāti* etc., where the *t* is always followed by a vowel and *ā* is hence preserved. In Aramaic **תְּ** we have the same form, the long vowel being preserved here in a closed syllable following the analogy of the forms with suffix, e. g., **תָּ** where it stands in an open syllable.¹ The Aramaic particle *uāt*, which occurs in the Hadad inscription, in Modern Syriac, and in the Syriac prepositions **لَهُ**, **لَهُمْ**, **لَهُنَّ**,² is probably a special modification of **iāt*, perhaps developed originally after a verbal form ending in *ū*, *-ū-iāt > -ū-uāt*.

The form **iāš* is found in the Assyrian oblique cases of the personal pronouns, viz., *iāši*, etc., under the same conditions as *iāt*.

with initial *k* of uncertain origin). The particle *'i* seems to occur alone as a *nota accusativi* in Syriac imperfects with suffix of 3 sg., e. g., **تَعْلَمَتْ** ‘he will kill her’. The particle *t* alone has the same force in Mehri, e. g., *qabham-t-ey* ‘they dishonored me’. Cf. Barth, *Pronominalbildung*, pp. 91–95; Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, vol. i, p. 315.

The particle *š* seems to occur without combination with other demonstrative particle in the first and second persons of **لَيْسْ** ‘is not’, e. g., **لَسْتَ**, which are perhaps based on a form **لَسْلَى*** composed of negative *lā* + *š* demonstrative, just as **لَقْ** ‘is not’ is made up of negative *lā* + demonstrative particle *t*; cf. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, London, 1863–93, vol. 7, p. 2683, cols. 1 and 2; Wright-DeGoeje, *Arabic Grammar*, Cambridge, 1896–98, vol. 1, p. 96, rem. b, vol. 2, p. 105, rem. e; contrast Brockelmann, *op. cit.* p. 190 b a.

¹ Long vowels in originally closed syllables are not uncommon in Aramaic, uniforming analogy being responsible in most cases as here, cf. Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, vol. i, p. 64 r.

² Cf. Barth, *Pronominalbildung*, p. 95.

The form *'it occurs in Aramaic **אִתָּה אַתָּה**, **אַתְּ** (perhaps also in Punic *yth*), the long *i* being retained in the forms ending in a consonant before nouns, after the analogy of the forms with suffixes, e. g., **אַתְּלִי** etc., as in the case of **תִּתְ** above.

The form *'iš has apparently been preserved in Hebrew **שָׁנָה**, **שָׁנִים** (II Sam. 14, 19; Mi. 6, 10; Prov. 18, 24) used in the same sense as **שֵׁם**, tho why the vowel is not shortened in the closed syllable is not clear.¹

In the second series of forms with short vowels, *iat, *iaš have apparently not been preserved. The form *'it is found in Hebrew **תְּמִימָה** (*i* being changed to *e* under the influence of the accent). The form *'iš is perhaps to be found in Syriac **تَمِيمٌ**, **تَمِيمًا**, pl. **تَمِيمًا** ‘matter, thing’, and in Arabic **اسْتَمِيمٌ** (**اسْتَمِيمُ**) ‘foundation, basis’ (but cf. Ass. *uššû*);² possibly also in Assyrian *išu* (see below).

In the series of analogical forms, 'aš, 'at, 'aš,³ iit, iis apparently do not occur. The form *'at is represented by Hebrew **תְּמִימָה** which is used only with pronominal suffix, the long vowel (ô for original â) thus always standing in an open syllable.⁴ The form *'iit occurs perhaps in Arabic **لَيْمَّاث** ‘would that’ (*laita* <*lâ-iit-a*; *la* = verily, *iit* ‘that’, *a* adverbial ending).⁵ The form *'iis is found in Hebrew **שֵׁם** (<*iis*), Arabic **لَيْمَسَ** (*la-iṣa*

¹ It is not impossible that Heb. **שָׁנָה** ‘man’, which has no etymology, is ultimately derived from this demonstrative form. Egypt. *z* (formerly read *s*) ‘man’ is identified by Prof. Sethe (so Dr. Ember informs me) with the demonstratives, Arab. **ذُو**, **هُوَ**, etc.; on the other hand Lithuanian *pats* originally ‘lord, husband’ means now ‘he himself’. So it would seem not beyond the bounds of possibility that a word meaning ‘that one’ used by wives of their husbands should come to have the meaning of ‘husband, man’.

² Cf. Payne-Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, Oxonii, 1868—1901, vol. i, p. 403, col. 1; and Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon*, vol. i, p. 56, cols. 1 and 2.

³ If it were not for the fact that many Arabic words have forms with all three vowels *a*, *i*, *u* without difference of meaning **سَهْلٌ** might be regarded as derived from the form *'aš*.

⁴ The Hebrew **תְּמִימָה**, Syriac **لَمِيم** ‘sign’ are perhaps ultimately identical with the particle *'at*.

⁵ Contrast Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, vol. 1, p. 137 c.

<*lā-iš-a*; *lā* ‘not’, *iš* ‘that’, *a* verbal ending),¹ and probably also in Assyrian *išu* (<*išu*) stem of the verb *išu*.

Where the Phenician *nota accusativi* **תְּאִין** is to be placed is not clear. Probably it is the same form as Old Aramaic **תְּאִין** (i. e., *iš-iāt*).² Later Punic *yth* may be a contraction of this form or a representative of the form **it* (see above). Phen. **תְּאִין** without ‘ may be simply a careless spelling for **תְּאִין**. Assyrian *attu* used before pronominal suffixes to make emphatic possessive pronouns is also problematical.³

III. The Multiplicative Numerals in Aramaic and Hebrew.

In the Aramaic dialects the multiplicative numerals are expressed by **חַד** ‘one’ followed by the cardinal in the form used with masculine nouns, e. g., **חַד שְׁבָעָה** ‘seven-fold’; in Syriac the cardinal may also be preceded by the preposition **כְּ**, e. g., **כְּשֶׁבֶעָה**, **כְּשֶׁבֶעָה** ‘two fold’.

In these constructions the **חַד** before the simple numerals is to be considered a construct state, the expressions meaning ‘a two-fold one,’ ‘a seven-fold one’, etc. The expressions may be used adverbially, e. g.,

חַד שְׁבָעָה ‘seven times’ (Dan. 3, 19).

כְּשֶׁבֶעָה ‘double’ (Ex. 22, 7).

כְּשֶׁבֶעָה ‘seven-fold’ (Gen. 4, 24).

or substantively or adjectively, e. g.,

עַל חַד תְּרֵין ‘on the basis of a double one, double’ (Onkelos, Ex. 22, 3).

כְּשֶׁבֶעָה כְּשֶׁבֶעָה ‘a double break’ (Jer. 17, 18).

In Syriac, the construction with **כְּ** is apparently later than the one without. The meaning of the original construction here

¹ The form **אִיָּסֶן** which occurs as an affirmative of **לִיְסֶן** in such expressions as **מִן חַיְשָׁת אִיָּסֶן וְלִיְסֶן**, **מִן אִיָּסֶן וְלִיְסֶן** ‘from where he is or is not’, (cf. Lane, *op. cit.*, vol. vii, p. 2685, cols. 1 and 2) is probably some form like ‘is or ‘is (< *iš* or *iš*) changed to *ais* thru analogy with the diphthong *ai* in *laisa*.

² Cf. Barth, *Pronominalbildung*, p. 94.

³ Cf. *op. cit.* pp. 23, 95.

is becoming dim, and the force is freshened up by the use of **־**, probably in the sense of ‘multiplied by.’

In Hebrew the multiplicatives so far as they are not rendered by a circumlocution with a noun meaning ‘time’, are ordinarily expressed by a form ending in *-aim*,¹ but in a few passages we have a construction that is exactly the same as the Aramaic idiom just discussed. This is the construct chain פִי שְׁנָים ‘a face of two, two faced, two sided, two-fold’ which occurs three times used as a substantive meaning ‘a double portion’ followed by the preposition בְּ used partitively, e. g.,

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה יְהוָה נָא פִי שְׁנָים בְּרוּחָךְ אֶלְךָ
(II Ki. 2, 9 cf. Dt. 21, 17).

פִי שְׁנָים בְּהֵיכֶרֶת
be cut off’ (Zech. 13, 8).

IV. Mixed Constructions in Hebrew and Aramaic.

A great deal has been written about the modification of separate words and forms resulting from the influence of other words or forms which have some point in common with them, in other words, about analogical changes in the domain of morphology (e. g., Heb. **אנָבִי** ānōkî for *ānōku = Ass. *anāku*, under influence of suffix -i ‘my’, etc.) but little, so far as I know, has been written about changes in construction due to the influence of analogy.

Generally speaking such changes take place when the same idea or similar ideas may be expressed by different constructions. Here in many cases a new construction or constructions may arise consisting of a mixture of the original constructions.

Examples of such mixture in English are, e. g.,
explain it to (mixture of *explain it by* and *asccribe it to*) :
in order not to avoid (mixture of *not to have* and *to avoid*) ;
to hear to a thing (mixture of *to hear a thing* and *to listen to a thing*) :

put on the same equal (mixture of *put on the same level*,
put on an equality, make equal) ; etc. etc.

The object of the present paper is to point out some examples of a similar character in Hebrew and Aramaic.

¹ Cf. my paper, *The dual ending -aim in the Hebrew multiplicative numerals*, AJSL, vol. 33, no. 2 (Jan., 1917), pp. 148, 149.

(1)

In Hebrew the ordinal numerals are usually expressed either by the ordinal used as an adjective, or by the cardinal in the genitive after the noun, e. g.,

בָשְׁנָה הַתְּשִׁיעִית {
בָשְׁנָת תְּשִׁיעָה

It is possible, however, to say also

בָשְׁנִית הַתְּשִׁיעִית.

Here we have a mixture of the two constructions above, the speaker or writer beginning with one and ending with the other. This construction occurs also in Jer. 46, 2; 51, 59; 28, 1 *Kt.* (4th) : Ezr. 7, 8 (7th) : Jer. 32, 1 *Kt.* (10th).

(2)

In Hebrew after an oath the statement that is emphasized is introduced sometimes by כִּי 'verily', sometimes by אָם 'if'. כִּי is the proper particle for example after חַי יְהוָה 'as the Lord lives', אָם the proper particle for example after כִּי־עֲשָׂה יְהוָה 'the Lord do so to . . .', e. g.,

חַי יְהוָה כִּי יִשְׁרָאֵל
(I Sam. 29, 6; cf. 14, 39).

כִּי־עֲשָׂה יְהוָה לְךָ אָם־תִּכְחַדֵּר מִמֶּנִּי דָבָר
thee . . . if thou hide anything from me' (I Sam. 3, 17).

Constructions like כִּי־עֲשָׂה יְהוָה לְךָ and חַי יְהוָה אָם are due to a mixture of the two constructions above, and כִּי־עֲשָׂה יְהוָה having come to be regarded as equivalent expressions, e. g.,

חַי־יְהוָה אָם־אָקֵח
[= may the Lord punish me] if I take it' (II Ki. 5, 16; cf. II Sam. 11. 11; I Sam. 14, 45).

כִּי־עֲשָׂה יְהוָה לְיִ" כִּי־הַמֹּות יִפְרִיר בֵּינִי וּבֵינֶךָ
'the Lord do so to me . . . [= I solemnly swear) only death shall part me and thee' (Ru. 1, 17; cf. I Sam. 14, 44; I Ki. 2, 23).

From such sentences as those in the first example אָם develops the meaning of a negative after any oath or asseveration and

its negative אַם־לֹא the force of a strong affirmative.¹ These particles therefore often replace the conjunction בִּי or אֲשֶׁר 'that' after a verb or phrase meaning 'swear', and the preposition מִן after the expression חֲלִילָה לְ 'far be it from . . . to', e. g.,

וְנִכְרַתָּה בְּרִית עָמָךְ אַם־תַּעֲשֵׂה עַמְנוּ רָעָה covenant with thee [that] thou wilt not hurt us' (Gen. 26, 28—29; cf. Gen. 14, 23; 21, 23; I Sam. 3, 14; Dt. 1, 34f.; Gen. 24, 37;² Is. 14, 24).³

חֲלִילָה לְ 'far be it from me to swallow up or destroy' (II Sam. 20, 20; cf. Job 27, 5).⁴

(3)

In Biblical Aramaic the construction—

וּבָעוּ דָנִיאֵל וְחֶבְרוֹן לְהַתְקִטְלָה his companions to kill them' (Dan. 2, 13)

is apparently the result of a mixture of ideas. The same idea might be expressed by the following constructions, viz.:

וּבָעוּ דָנִיאֵל וְכָעֵד "�ח" לְמַקְטֵל 'they sought to kill D. and his companions',
וּבָעוּ דָנִיאֵל וְכָעֵד "�ח" לְמַקְטֵל הַמּוֹ to kill them',
וּבָעוּ דָנִיאֵל וְכָעֵד "�ח" לְהַתְקִטְלָה 'D. and his companions were sought to be killed'.

Now the active plural of a verb is often used in the sense of a passive, so the writer of the passage, after beginning the sentence in the active construction, felt the phrase וּבָעוּ דָנִיאֵל וְכָעֵד "�ח" as the equivalent of וְכָעֵד "�ח" and so finished the sentence according to the passive construction.

¹ From this use is derived the use of these particles as independent adverbs meaning 'not' and 'verily', cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Heb. Gram.*²⁸ § 149 e.

² Contrast with Gen. 24, 3 where אֲשֶׁר is used after חֲשֵׂבֵי.

³ In the last three examples אַם and אַם לֹא are preceded by לְאַמְרָה e. g., in the first, וַיֵּשֶׁבּוּ לְאַמְרָה אַם. Such cases form a transition category between the other examples and those cases in which the particles are used as independent adverbs in independent clauses, cf. n. 1.

⁴ For examples of מִן after חֲלִילָה לְ cf. Gen. 18, 25; 44, 7; 17; Jos. 24, 16.

(4)

In Biblical Aramaic a final clause may be expressed just as in Hebrew either by ל + infinitive or by ו + finite verb, e. g.,

מִזְשָׁם לְכֶם טָעַם בַּיִתָּא רָנָה לְבָנָא ‘who commanded you to build this house?’ (Ezr. 5, 3).

לְהַן חֲלֹמָא אָמָרָוּ לֵי וְאַנְדָעַ דִּי ‘therefore tell me the dream that I may know that . . .’ (Dan. 2, 9).

In three passages we have what seems to be a mixture of the two constructions, e. g.,

וּבְعָא “**דִּי וּמָן יִתְּזַלֵּה וַיְפִשְׂרָא לְחַחְוִיה לְמֶלֶךְ** ‘and he asked that time be given to him that he might make known the interpretation to the king’ (Dan. 2, 16).

Here **וַיְפִשְׂרָא לְחַחְוִיה לְמֶלֶךְ** is a mixture of

פִשְׂרָא לְחַחְוִיה לְמֶלֶךְ and

וַיְפִשְׂרָא יְחַחְוֵא לְמֶלֶךְ

Cf. also Dan. 2, 18; 5, 15.¹

The same mixed construction is found in Hebrew, especially in late passages, e. g., **וְלִתְתָּ** ‘in order to give’ Ex. 32, 29; **וְלִנְדַּלְתָּם** ‘in order to educate them’ (Dan. 1, 5), etc.²

Similarly in Syriac, where נ + infinitive and נ + finite verb are equivalent final constructions, we find occasionally final clauses in which the verb is in the infinitive after נ introduced by the final conjunction נ, e. g.,

إِنْ تُحِبَّ مَسْعِدَاتِهِ حُكْمِهِ أَدْعُوكَ حَكْمَهُ

‘if thou desirest to learn these things with diligence.’

¹ Contrast Torrey, *Notes on the Aramaic Part of Daniel*, Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, vol. xv, July, 1909, p. 257.

² Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Heb. Gram.*²⁸ § 114 p.

³ Cf. Nöldeke, *Syriac Grammar* (transl. by Crichton), London, 1904, § 286.